

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office action dated September 17, 2008. Claims 1-4 and 6-28 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 4, and 28 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement was electronically filed on January 4, 2008, as evidenced by the electronic copy viewable on the PAIR system. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to return an initialed copy of the Information Disclosure Statement, indicating that the information therein has been considered.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that Claim 28 is allowable and that Claims 9, 12, 13, 16-23, 26 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has chosen not to so rewrite these claims at this time because their respective base claims are believed to be patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 14, 15, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,600,570 (*Okada*); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,143,148 (*Guth*); and Claims 3 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0026096 (*Ellens, et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and submits that independent Claims 1, 4, and 28, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a light influencing element for directing light issued from a light source into a predetermined angular range, wherein the light influencing element

has a plurality of rib-like raster elements which have reflecting side walls and are arranged in a regular structure, and wherein the raster elements have a maximum height of 5mm.

Among other features of Claim 1, is that the light influencing element has "a plurality of rib-like raster elements, which have reflecting side walls". By virtue of this feature, light is reflected by the raster elements to a predetermined angular range.

Okada, as understood by Applicant, relates to a louver that employs beams of a grid, each beam being made of a transparent material in the shape of a cylindrical lens or a multiprism lens. (*Okada*, col. 2, ll. 23-25). Apparently light from a light source passing through the beams is refracted (not reflected) in limited directions to achieve the desired condition of illumination. (*Okada*, col. 1, 39-42). Therefore, at most, *Okada* relates to a louver that has a grid of beams that direct light by refraction rather than reflection.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over *Okada*.

Claim 4 is directed to a light influencing element for directing light issued from a light source into a predetermined angular range, wherein the light influencing element has a plurality of rib-like raster elements which have reflecting side walls and are arranged in a regular structure, comprising a transparent base plate having a broad side on which the raster elements are arranged.

Among other features of Claim 4 is that the light influencing element directs light issuing from a light source into a predetermined angular range. By virtue of this feature light can be directed within a particular angular area.

Guth, as understood by Applicant, relates to a light shield that uses a transparent element to partially refract and reflect light issuing from a light source, such as an incandescent light bulb. As shown in Fig. 3 and described at col. 4, page 2, lines 57-64, the light rays emerging from the bottom of the light shield are at many different angles, and are not at anything that can be considered a predetermined angle. According to *Guth*, "...some of which rays are directed almost vertically downwardly, while others are raised to angles greater than their angles of incidence." (*Guth*, col. 4, page 2, lines 59-62). The resulting effect of the infinite number of paths for the light rays passing through the light shield is to randomly disperse the light issuing from the light source rather than to direct the light to a predetermined angular range. Nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Guth* that would teach or suggest the above recitations of Claim 4.

Accordingly, Claim 4 is patentable over *Guth*.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank A. DeLucia
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,476

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2767189v1